EXHIBIT A

EXHIBIT A TABLE OF CONTENTS

Name	Exhibit	List of Exhibits
· 	No.	
Acosta, Cynthia	A-1	 a. Notice of Removal b. Plaintiffs' Motion to Remand c. American Home Products Corporation's Memorandum in Opposition to Plaintiffs' Motion to Remand d. Plaintiffs' Reply to Defendant American Home Products Corporation's Opposition to Plaintiffs' Motion to Remand e. AHP Defendants' Motion, and Incorporated Memorandum in Support, for Leave to File Supplemental Exhibits to Opposition to Remand f. AHP's Second Supplemental Memorandum in Support of its Motion to Transfer to Section R and/or for Stay of Proceedings Pending Transfer to MDL g. AHP Defendants' Motion, and Incorporated Memorandum in Support, for Leave to File Supplemental Authorities on Transfer and Stay Issues h. AHP Defendants' Motion, and Incorporated Memorandum in Support, for Leave to File Second Supplemental Memorandum on Stay Motion i. AHP Defendants' Motion, and Incorporated Memorandum in Support, for Leave to File Second Supplemental Memorandum on Stay Motion i. AHP Defendants' Motion, and Incorporated Memorandum in Support, for Leave to File Memorandum in Excess of 25 Pages j. Response to Removal Order k. Motion to Substitute Original Consents to Removal
Alfonso, Erilda	A-2	 a. Notice of Removal b. Plaintiffs' Motion to Remand and IncorporatedMemorandum c. Plaintiff's Request for Oral Argument on Motion to Remand d. Wyeth's Memorandum in Opposition to Plaintiffs' Motion to Remand e. AHP Defendants' Motion, and Incorporated Memorandum in Support, for Leave to File Memorandum in Excess of 25 Pages

Areaux, Millie	A-3	a. Notice of Removal
Areaux, Millie	A-3	b. Plaintiffs' Motion to Remand
		c. Wyeth's Memorandum in Opposition to
]	Plaintiffs' Motion to Remand
Armetrone Doule T	A-4	a. Notice of Removal
Armstrong, Paula T	A-4	b. Plaintiffs' Motion to Remand
		c. Wyeth's Memorandum in Opposition to
	*	Plaintiffs' Motion to Remand
		d. Wyeth's Supplemental Memorandum in
		Opposition to Plaintiffs' Motion to Remand
		e. Wyeth's Motion for Leave to File
		Supplemental Memorandum in Opposition
		to Motion to Remand
		f. Wyeth's Motion, and Incorporated
	:	Memorandum in Support, for Leave to File
		Memorandum in Excess of 25 Pages
		g. Response to Removal Order
August, Flora	A-5	a. Notice of Removal
		b. Plaintiffs' Motion to Remand and
		Incorporated Memorandum of Law in
		Support of Motion to Remand
		c. Wyeth's Memorandum in Opposition to
		Plaintiffs' Motion to Remand
Barrie, Dorothy	A-6	a. Notice of Removal
		b. Plaintiff's Motion to Remand and
		Incorporated Memorandum of Law in
		Support of Motion to Remand
		c Wyeth's Memorandum in Opposition to
		Plaintiff's Motion to Remand
Benn, Helen	A-7	a. Notice of Removal
		b. Plaintiffs' Motion to Remand
		c. Plaintiffs' Memorandum of Law in Support
		of Motion to Remand
		d. Wyeth's Memorandum in Opposition to
		Plaintiffs' Motion to Remand
		e. Wyeth's Supplemental Memorandum in
		Opposition to Plaintiffs' Motion to Remand
		f. Plaintiff's Request for Oral Argument on
,		Motion to Remand
		g. Notice of Hearing
		h. Wyeth's Motion, and Incorporated
		Memorandum in Support, for Leave to File
·		Memorandum in Excess of 25 Pages
		i. Wyeth's Motion for Leave to File
		Supplemental Memorandum in Opposition to
		Motion to Remand

		j. Response to Removal Order
Benquist, Dolores	A-8	a. Notice of Removal
1		b. Plaintiffs' Motion to Remand
		c. Plaintiffs' Memorandum of Law in Support
		of Motion to Remand
		d. Wyeth's Memorandum in Opposition to
		Plaintiffs' Motion to Remand
Bergeron, Rosalie	A-9	a. Notice of Removal
		b. Plaintiffs' Motion to Remand and
		Incorporated Memorandum
		c. American Home Products Corporation's
		Memorandum in Opposition to Plaintiffs'
		Motion to Remand
		d. American Home Products Defendants'
		Motion, and Incorporated Memorandum in
		Support, for Leave to File Supplemental
		Exhibits to Opposition to Remand
		e. American Home Products Supplemental
		Memorandum in Support of it's Opposition
		to Plaintiffs' Motion to Remand
Bonvillian, Linda	A-10	a. Notice of Removal
		b. Plaintiffs' Motion to Remand and
	1	Incorporated Memorandum
		c. American Home Products Memorandum in
		Opposition to Plaintiffs' Motion to Remand
		d. Plaintiff's Request for Oral Argument on
		Motion to Remand
		e. American Home Products Defendants'
		Motion, and Incorporated Memorandum in
		Support, For Leave to File Memorandum in
		Excess of 25 Pages
Boudreaux, Melanie	A-11	a. Notice of Removal
-		b. Plaintiff's Motion to Remand and
		Incorporated Memorandum
		c. American Home Products Corporation's
		Memorandum in Opposition to Plaintiff's
		Motion to Remand
Breaux, Ronald	A-12	a. Notice of Removal
		b. Plaintiff's Motion to Remand
	A TOP OF THE PROPERTY OF THE P	c. Plaintiffs' Memorandum of Law in Support
		of Motion to Remand
		d. Wyeth's Memorandum in Opposition to
		Plaintiff's Motion to Remand
Daigle, Roselyn	A-13	a. Notice of Removal
		b. Plaintiffs' Motion to Remand
		c. Plaintiffs' Memorandum of Law in Support

Elstrott, Janice	A-14	of Motion to Remand d. Wyeth's Memorandum in Opposition to Plaintiffs' Motion to Remand e. Wyeth's Supplemental Memorandum in Opposition to Plaintiffs' Motion to Remand f. Wyeth's Second Supplemental Memorandum in Opposition to Plaintiffs' Motion to Remand a. Notice of Removal b. Plaintiffs' Motion to Remand and Incorporated Memorandum c. American Home Products Corporation's Memorandum in Opposition to Plaintiffs'
Fabre, Elizabeth	A-15	 Motion to Remand a. Notice of Removal b. Plaintiffs' Motion to Remand c. Plaintiffs' Memorandum of Law in Support of Motion to Remand d. Wyeth's Memorandum in Opposition to Plaintiffs' Motion to Remand e. Wyeth's Supplemental Memorandum in Opposition to Plaintiffs' Motion to Remand f. Wyeth's Second Supplemental Memorandum in Opposition to Plaintiffs' Motion to Remand
Hegeman, Katherine	A-16	 a. Notice of Removal b. Plaintiffs' Motion to Remand and Incorporated Memorandum of Law in Support of Motion to Remand c. Wyeth's Memorandum in Opposition to Plaintiffs' Motion to Remand
James, Konnee et al.	A-17	 a. Notice of Removal b. Plaintiffs' Motion to Remand c. Plaintiffs' Memorandum of Law in Support of Motion to Remand d. Wyeth's Memorandum in Opposition to Plaintiffs' Motion to Remand
Kershenstine, Paula	A-18	 a. Notice of Removal b. Plaintiff's Motion to Remand and Incorporated Memorandum of Law in Support of Motion to Remand c. Wyeth's Memorandum in Opposition to Plaintiff's Motion to Remand d. Wyeth's Supplemental Memorandum in Opposition to Plaintiff's Motion to Remand

Tr: 11 G1 1	T 4 10	NI ('CD1
Kidd, Shavonda	A-19	a. Notice of Removal
		b. Plaintiffs' Motion to Remand
		c. Plaintiffs' Memorandum of Law in Support
		of Motion to Remand
		d. Wyeth's Memorandum in Opposition to
		Plaintiffs' Motion to Remand
King, Grace et al.	A-20	a. Notice of Removal
] :	b. Plaintiffs' Motion to Remand
		c. Plaintiffs' Memorandum of Law in Support
		of Motion to Remand
		d. Wyeth's Memorandum in Opposition to
		Plaintiffs' Motion to Remand
Logos, Audrey	A-21	a. Notice of Removal
8,,		b. Plaintiff's Motion to Remand and
•		Incorporated Memorandum of Law in
		Support of Motion to Remand
		c. Response to Removal Order
		d. Wyeth's Memorandum in Opposition to
		Plaintiff's Motion to Remand
Norwood, Elaine Green	A-22	a. Notice of Removal
1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	11 22	b. Plaintiffs' Motion to Remand and
		Incorporated Memorandum of Law in
t T		Support of Motion to Remand
		c. Wyeth's Memorandum in Opposition to
		Plaintiffs' Motion to Remand
Porche, Cynthia	A-23	a. Notice of Removal
Forche, Cynuna	A-23	b. Intervenors' Motion to Remand and
		Incorporated Memorandum
		c. American Home Products Corporation's
		Opposition to Plaintiffs' Motion to Remand
		1 **
		d. Plaintiff's Reply to Defendant American
		Home Products Corporation's Opposition to
	1 04	Plaintiffs' Motion to Remand
Smallwood, Gina	A-24	a. Notice of Removal
		b. Plaintiffs' Motion to Remand and
		Incorporated Memorandum of Law in
		Support of Motion to Remand
		c. Wyeth's Memorandum in Opposition to
<u> </u>		Plaintiffs' Motion to Remand
Smith, Alan	A-25	a. Notice of Removal
		b. Plaintiffs' Motion to Remand
		c. Plaintiffs' Memorandum of Law in Support
		of Motion to Remand
		d. Wyeth's Memorandum in Opposition to
		Plaintiffs' Motion to Remand
	1	e. Wyeth's Supplemental Memorandum in

	A 200	Opposition to Plaintiffs' Motion to Remand f. Wyeth's Second Supplemental Memorandum in Opposition to Plaintiffs Motion to Remand
Smith, Delores	A-26	 a. Notice of Removal b. Plaintiffs' Motion to Remand and Incorporated Memorandum c. American Home Products Corporation's Memorandum in Opposition to Plaintiffs' Motion to Remand
Tapp, Barbara	A-27	 a. Notice of Removal b. Plaintiffs' Motion to Remand and Incorporated Memorandum of Law in Support of Motion to Remand c. Wyeth's Memorandum in Opposition to Plaintiffs' Motion to Remand d. Wyeth's Supplemental Memorandum in Opposition to Plaintiffs' Motion to Remand
Williams, Bobbie L.	A-28	 a. Notice of Removal b. Plaintiffs' Motion to Remand c. Plaintiffs' Memorandum of Law in Support of Motion to Remand d. Wyeth's Memorandum in Opposition to Plaintiffs' Motion to Remand e. Wyeth's Supplemental Memorandum in Opposition to Plaintiffs' Motion to Remand
Williams, Catherine	A-29	 a. Notice of Removal b. Plaintiffs' Motion to Remand and Incorporated Memorandum of Law in Support of Motion to Remand c. Wyeth's Memorandum in Opposition to Plaintiffs' Motion to Remand
Womack, Gail M.	A-30	 a. Notice of Removal b. Plaintiff's Motion to Remand and Incorporated Memorandum of Law in Support of Motion to Remand c. Wyeth's Memorandum in Opposition to Plaintiff's Motion to Remand

EXHIBIT B

e 2:02-c\	/-2	UI	Si)-г	1D		L	OC	Jui	116	וו וג	1	D- 2	_		ΓII	ea	U	4/(JOI	20	JU	J	-	٦a	ge	; 9	OI	2	כ	
SALES REP DEFENDANT NAMED?																															
PHYSICIAN DEFENDANT NAMED?	Ā	Ϋ́	Ā	Å	Å	Y	Y	Ā	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Υ	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
PHENTERMINE DEFENDANT NAMED?	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Å	Υ	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Ϋ́	Υ	Å	Y	Y	Y	γ
SEVERANCE ORDER	No																										-				
<u>WDL#</u>	02-21043																														
COMPLAINT DATE	12/4/01									-																					
CASE	ACOSTA																														
PLAINTIFE	1. Acosta, Cynthia	2. Adams, Sophia	3. Allen, Gladys	4. Andrews, Mildred	5. Austin, Marenda		7. Bates, Kim		1	10. Bonnette, Robert	11. Bonvillian, Linda	12. Bordelon, Donna	13. Boyle, Barbara	14. Brown, Cheryl	15. Brown, Nell	16. Bruno, Michelle		18. Chapoton, Stephanie	19. Charles, Lisa		21. Daniels, Denise	22. Daniels, Elise		24. Dor, William Patrick	25. Doyle, Georgia	26. Durand, Jacquelyn	27. Elgin, Gregory	28. Evans, Christine	29. Fassbender, Lolly	30. Fava, Tonya	31. Fentress, Dora

Case	2:	:02	2-c	V-2	20	13	35-	HE	3	I	Do	cu	me	en	t 1	8-	2		F	ile	d ()4/	'08	3/2	00)5		P	ag	e ′	10	of	29	9	
SALES REP DEFENDANT NAMED?							-																- Harrison Control of the Control of												
PHYSICIAN DEFENDANT NAMED?	Y	Y	Y	Å	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y		Y	Y	Y	X	Å	Y	Y	Ą	Y	Y	λ	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
PHENTERMINE DEFENDANT NAMED?	Y	Y	Λ	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y		Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Ā	Y	Å	Y	Y	Y	Ā	Y	Y	Y	Υ	Y	Å
SEVERANCE ORDER																											3								
MDF #	-					:																													
COMPLAINT																																			
CASE																													Mary and the state of the state			Control			
PLAINTIFE	32. Francis, Beverly	33. Gaines, Brenda	34. Green, Gail	35. Jenson, Gwen Boyes	36. Jones, Litena	37. Kaufman, Connie	38. Klees, Stacey	39. Labatut, Susan	40. Lear, Kathy	41. Lee, Gwendolyn	42. Mallard, Linda	43. Mar, Charleen	44. Maunoir, Rhonda	Labat	45. Mayeaux, Barbara	46. Mayeaux, Donald	47. McCurdy, Terrie	48. McDaniel, Danita	49. McElroy, Paula B.	50. McGee, Doris	51. McKinney, Louvenia	52. McLeod, Kathy	53. Merrick, Ruby	54. Mire, Jay	55. Moran, Kathleen	56. Ned, Martha	57. Nini, Susan Speigel	58. Norris, Cynthia	59. O'Rourk, Irwin	60. Peneguy, Edwin	61. Petticrew, Linda	62. Poceh, Jamieson	63. Rainey, Vernita	64. Ramirez, Brenda	65. Ramogase, Samantha

Case	2:	02	2-c	V-2	20	13	5-	HE	3]	Οo	CU	m	en	t 1	8-	2	Fi	ile	d (04/	/08	3/2	00)5	-	Р	ag	e '	11	of	29	9	
SALES REP DEFENDANT NAMED?																																		
PHYSICIAN DEFENDANT NAMED?	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Å	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Ā	Y	Y	Ā			Y	Y	Å	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	λ	Υ	Y	Y	λ	Y	^
PHENTERMINE DEFENDANT NAMED?	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Ā	Υ	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y			Y	Y	λ	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Ā	Y	Y	λ	Y	Y	**
SEVERANCE ORDER																	No																	
MDL#															:		02-20135									-								
COMPLAINT DATE															-		12/04/01	(Petition for Intervention)				A STATE OF THE STA												
CASE																	ALFONSO	INTERVENTION (PEGGY MARTINEZ	ET AL.)															
PLAINTIRE	66. Reed, Regina	67. Robinson, Nicole	68. Roy, Burnett	69. Rushing, Janell	70. Sanmartin, Eva	71. Savoie, Julie	72. Schwan, Rhonda	73. Scott, Jacqueline	74. Silva, Kristen	75. Songy, Roy	76. Stevens, Victoria	77. Turner, Sybil	78. Usey, Kirk	79. Vedros, Lilia	80. Washington, Bernita	81. Williams, Janine	1. Alfonso, Erilda			2. Bracey, Susan	3. Braquet, Betty		5. Bynes, Maura Currera		7. Constant, Gladys	8. Dothy, Gail	į.	l	11. Durapau, Toni L.	12. Eumont, Audrey		14. Galley, Adam	15. Gaudet, Karen	

Case	2:	:02	2-c	:V-	20	13	5-	HE	3	[Οo	CU	ım	en	nt 1	8-	2		Fi	lec	0 b	4/	80	/2	00	5		Pa	age	e 1	2	of	29	}	
SALES REP DEFENDANT NAMED?																																			9994
PHYSICIAN DEFENDANT NAMED?	Y	Y	Y	Y	λ	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y																	
PHENTERMINE DEFENDANT NAMED?	Y	Ϋ́	Y	Y	Y	Ą	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Ą	Y	Y	Å	Ā	X	Ā	À	Ā	Ā	Ā	X	Ā	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Ϋ́
<u>SEVERANCE</u> <u>ORDER</u>																			PTO 4616							PTO 4615									
WDF.#										:									02-20239							02-20138									
COMPLAINT DATE															The state of the s				8/1/02					A		09/30/02									
CASE																			AREAUX							ARMSTRONG									
PLAINTIFF	17. Karlow, Norma	18. Kemp, Betty B.	19. Kessling, Harold	20. Kirsch, Linda M.	21. Knight, Donna	22. Lassus, Germaine W.	23. Lilly, Diane	24. Manzella, Charlene	25. McKenna, Wayne	26. Owen, Mary	27. Penney, Audrey	28. Perez, Wanda	29. Powel, Dianne	30. Rodrigue, Pretissa	31. Sallinger, Nicholas	32. Sanchez, Susan	33. Trosclair, Tonie D.	34. Vacarella, John			3. Smith, Sandra L.	4. Lilly, Carolyn	5. Harwell, Noel		7. Duveilh, Terry D.	1. Armstrong, Paula T	2. Bell, Lester	3. Birden, Tracy	4. Berkel, Jacqueline	5. Broussard, Aquanell	6. Brown, Edelina M.	7. Burke, Brunnette		9. Causey, Tashia	10. Conerly-Smith, Cathy

Case	2:0	2-0	CV-	20	13	5-	HE	3		Do	cu	m	en	t 1	8-	2		Fi	led	d C)4/	80	/20	00	5		Pa	ge	1	3	of	29
SALES REP DEFENDANT NAMED?																				1	Y				A CONTRACTOR OF THE CONTRACTOR							
PHYSICIAN DEFENDANT NAMED?						The second secon												The second secon			λ [;]	X	Y					Y :	X	Ā	Ā	>-
PHENTERMINE DEFENDANT NAMED?	Y Y	Y	Y	Ā	Λ	Y	Y	Å	Y	Å	¥	¥	Å.	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y		X	Y	Y Y	J.	X	X	À	Ā	λ	Y	>
SEVERANCE ORDER										PTO 4615		The second secon			11. 11. 10.00.00			The second secon			N/A	PTO 4622	100 t Otto	F10 4021				No				No
WDF#										03-20150											03-20114	03-20096	*******	02-20244				02-20136				02-20130
COMPLAINT DATE		The second secon							in the second se	10/01/02								100000000000000000000000000000000000000			8/30/02	7/12/02	007.17.0	8/ //02				12/4/01				11/30/01
CASE										AUGUST								and the state of t			BARRIE	BENN		BENQUIST				BERGERON				BONVILLIAN INTERVENTION (ANN FRANZ ET
	11. Constant, Patty			15. Curtis, Kathy	16. Davis, Tammy	17. Douglas, Danise	18. Galdamez, Tanya	19. Graves, Sharon	20. Green, Evelyn		2. Andrews, Donna		4. Biro, Yvonne		6. Brown, Elvar M.	7. Davis, Linda S.	8. Davis, Yvette	9. Burgman, Roxanne	10. Taylor, Kimberly	11. Hottel, Angel O.	- 1	1. Benn, Helen					4. Jeter, Sheila		2. Livas, Shawnell	3. Rousseau, Kim	4. Smith, Katherine	 Bonvillian, Linda

Case	2:0	02	-C	V-	20	13	35-	·HI	В		Do	CL	ım	en	it 1	8-	2		F	ile	d (04	/08	3/2	200)5		P	ag	e ´	14	of	29	9	
SALES REP DEFENDANT NAMED?																																			
PHYSICIAN DEFENDANT NAMED?	7 X	I I	Y	Å	Y	Ā	Y	Y	Ÿ	Y	Y	Y			Y	Y	Y		Y												Y				
PHENTERMINE DEFENDANT NAMED?	4.8	Y	Y	Y	Y	Ā	Ā	Å	Ą	Y	Y	Y	Å	Y	Υ	Y	¥	- Control of the Cont	Ā	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	γ	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
SEVERANCE ORDER													PTO 4520		PTO 4618					No		in the state of th									PTO 4619	PTO 4606			
MDL#													02-20133		03-20136					03-20130											02-20134	03-20131			
<u>COMPLAINT</u> <u>DATE</u>			The second secon										12/4/01		7/16/02					8/01/02											12/4/01	8/29/02			
CASE	AL.)												BOUDREAUX		BREAUX					DAIGLE											ELSTROTT	FABRE			
PLAINTIFE	- 1		- 1	4. Charles, Lisa	5. Fava, Tonya	1	7. Hodes, Howard	8. O'Rourk, Irwin	9. Robinson, Nicole	10. Roy, Burnett	11. Songy, Roy L.	12. Vedros, Lilia		2. Scott, Darlene		2. Robertson, Adriena	3. Davenport,	Gwendolyn	4. Normand, Margie	1. Daigle, Roselyn et al		3. Reyes, Judy		5. Fourcade, Elinor	6. Frederick, Cheryl	7. Harris, Jackson, Sr.	8. Danos, Timothy	9. Bell, Lisa	Ι.	11. Meggs, Tonya	1. Elstrott, Janice	1. Fabre, Elizabeth et al	1		1

Case	2	:02	2-c	:V-	20	13	35-	HE	3	I	Οo	CL	ım	er	nt 1	18-	-2		F	ile	d ()4/	/08	3/2	00	5		Pa	ag	e '	15	of	29	9	
SALES REP DEFENDANT NAMED?										Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y														X						
PHYSICIAN DEFENDANT NAMED?																					distribution of the second of									Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	
PHENTERMINE DEFENDANT NAMED?	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Ā	Å	Y	γ	Y	Υ	Y	Y		Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	X	X	Y	λ	λ	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
SEVERANCE ORDER										PTO 4607						PTO 4599													N/A	PTO 4597					No
WDF#										03-20151			-			03-20064										-			03-20169	02-20224					03-20132
COMPLAINT DATE							:			11/7/02						10/8/02													11/07/03	7/16/02					10/29/02
CASE										HEGEMAN						JAMES													KERSHENSTINE	KIDD					KING
PLAINTHEE	5. Rogers, Wade E.	6. Lazard, Sylvia T.	7. Guidry, Jacquelyn		9. Bersuder, Caren M.	10. Domino, Joann M.	11. Sandras, Linda G.	12. Orsin, Carolyn	13. Harrell, Marilyn	1. Hegeman, Katherine	2. Hegeman, Doris	3. Yuratich, Debbie		5. Mull, Terri	١.	1. James, Konnee et al	2. McCorkle, Jacqueline	щ	3. Plaisance, Joan	4. Hebert, Elizabeth C.	5. Kelly, Charlene			ŀ	9. Preen, Mary D.	10. Williams, Bobbie	11. Shipley, Denise	12. Bonilla, Jody	1. Kershenstine, Paula	1. Kidd, Shavonda	2. Johnson, Mildred	3. Gaines, Patricia	4. Cooper, Tracy		

Case	2:	02	2-c	:V-	20	135	-HI	В	I	Docu	ım	er	nt 1	8-2	2		F	ile	d () 4,	/08	3/2	200)5		P	ag	e '	16	of	f 29
SALES REP DEFENDANT NAMED?													γ																		
PHYSICIAN DEFENDANT NAMED?																															Ā
PHENTERMINE DEFENDANT NAMED?	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	X	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	¥	***	X	$\overline{\lambda}$	Y	Λ	Λ	Ā	Å	Ā	Ā	Å	Λ	Y	Y	Ā	Y	X
<u>SEVERANCE</u> <u>ORDER</u>		0.000											N/A	PTO 4611																	No
MDL#				:									04-02132	03-20390																	02-20131
COMPLAINT DATE													7/6/04	8/29/02								The second secon									12/4/01
CASE													LOGOS	NORWOOD																	INTERVENTION (CATHY
<u>PLAINTIFF</u>	2. Kightell, Debra	3. Robert, James J. Jr.	4. Riley, Danny Ferrill	5. Recasner, Lisa		1	8. Young, Paula			11. Peuler, Bernard (estate of)	12. Morgan, Valerie	13. Meza, Lourdes	1. Logos, Audrey	1. Norwood, Elaine		- 1	3. Hargrave, Jessica	4. Romain, Tracy Hull	5. Watson, Marita Sims	:	7. Cortez, Susan	8. Johnson, Sethany	9. Landry, Donna	10. Rankin, Regina	11. Edwards, Shirley	12. Stewart, Ruby	13. Mitchell, Kermit	14. Scott, Elaine	15. Jones, Elaine		

Case	2:	:02	2-c	:V-	20	13	5-	HE	3		000	cui	me	nt	18	-2		F	ile	ed	04	//0	8/2	200)5	F	Pa	ge	17	7 o	of 29)
SALES REP DEFENDANT NAMED?				Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Λ	I															
PHYSICIAN DEFENDANT NAMED?		λ	Y																										Ā		. :	Y
PHENTERMINE DEFENDANT NAMED?		Ā	Y	Y	Y	Ą	Y	Å	Ā	Y	Ā	Ā	Å	Y	Ā		X	Ā	Y	Ā	Y	Ā	Y		Y	Y	Y	Y	Υ			Y
SEVERANCE ORDER				PTO 4610														PTO 4614											No			
MDL#				03-20430					- 5									03-20139											02-20135			
<u>COMPLAINT</u> <u>DATE</u>				£0/L/L														8/29/02											11/27/01	(Anderson)		
CASE	CHERAMIE ET AL.)			SMALLWOOD														SMITH, A.				The second secon							SMITH	INTERVENTION	(SANDRA ANDERSON ET AL.)	
PLAINTIFF		2. Guidry, Cheryl	3. Ketchens, Bridgette	1. Smallwood, Gina	2. Labiche, William	3. Pumila, Joann	4. Somme, Jenne	5. Ruiz, Myrna C.	6. Burkhardt, Lisa	7. Pichon, Joan		9. Bell, Shirley	10. Neal, Tanyell	11. Borel, Kim	12. Dusenbury, Timothy		13. Mattingly, Carolyn		2. Sapp, Clinton		4. Dawson, Rhonda B.	- 1	6. Rosenthal-Tucker,	- 1	- [8. Mones-Woodruff, Ruthie	9. Dauterive, Ronald	١.				2. Williams, Cynthia

Cas	e 2	:02	2-c	:V-	20	13	35-	HE	3		Do	CU	ım	en	ıt 1	18-	2		F	ile	d ()4/	08	3/2	00)5		P	ag	е	18	of 29
SALES REP DEFENDANT NAMED?	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y							Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Ā	
PHYSICIAN DEFENDANT NAMED?												A CONTRACTOR OF THE PROPERTY O																				
PHENTERMINE DEFENDANT NAMED?	Y	Ā	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	γ	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Ϋ́	Ϋ́	λ	Y	Y	Y		
SEVERANCE ORDER	PTO 4613						-			3		PTO 4609						PTO 4605	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,												N/A	
WDF#	03-20115											04-29780						03-20194													03-20549	
COMPLAINT DATE	11/22/02											10/11/02						2/11/03													8/29/03	
CASE	TAPP				The state of the s							WILLIAMS, B.						WILLIAMS, C.													WOMACK	
PLAINTIFF	1. Tapp, Barbara	2. Hammler, Alice		4. Wingate, Margaret	5. Lemoine, Ellen	6. Tember, Aselina	7. Palmer, Peggy	8. Walker, Michelle	9. Hills, Margaret	10. Johnson, Sharon	11. Thomas, Diane	1. Williams, Bobbie L.	2. Lovoi-Robin, Lolita	3. Meyers, Arthur		5. Cochrane, Laurence	١.	1. Williams, Catherine	2. Hebert, John		4. Prudeaux-Hill, Marva	5. Rheams, Gwendolyn	6. Brown, Cheryl M.	7. McGee, Sherry		9. Kacynski, Rachel		4	12. Heffer, Glvnn		1. Womack, Gail	

EXHIBIT C

Page 20 of 29

AFFIDAVIT OF VICKI KILCLINE

Before me, a notary public in and for said County and State, personally appeared Vicki Kilchie, who being by me duly sworn, deposes on oath and says:

- i. My name is Vicki Kilcline. I am over the age of eighteen years and make this affidavit based upon my personal knowledge.
- 2. Thave been employed by Wyeth, formerly known as American Home Products

 Corporation; since 1987. From approximately 1990 until 2002, I held the position of area

 account director. From 2002 until the present, I have held the position of area account manager.
- 3. While Redux was on the market, I never visited any private healthcare provider or supervised any Wyeth sales representative or area account manager who visited any private healthcare provider. During that time, my responsibility was to call on academic teaching accounts and supervise Wyeth employees who were responsible for goademic reaching accounts.
- I never advertised, assembled, created, designed, detailed, distributed, labeled, made, manufactured, marketed, packaged, promoted, sold, sterilized, supplied, tested, or warranted Pondimin or the few-phen combination (fenfluramine-phentermine) or trained anyone to do so. I never left samples of Pondimin with any healthcare provider. No one I have supervised as part of my responsibilities for Wyeth ever advertised, created, designed, detailed, labeled, made, manufactured, marketed, packaged, promoted, sold, sterilized, supplied, tested, or warranted Pondimin or the few-phen combination. I had no involvement in the development or preparation of package inserts for Pondimin and had no control over the content of those inserts or over other written warnings related to that drug. I did not answer questions from doctors about Pondimin

and I never promoted that drug. Indeed, I had no reason to promote Pondimin because I received no credit, commission, or bonus based on Pondimin sales.

- I never assembled, created, designed, distributed, labeled, made, manufactured, packaged, sterilized, supplied, tested, or warranted Redux, or trained anyone to do so. I never left samples of Redux with any healthcare provider. I had no involvement in the development or preparation of package inserts for Redux; and had no control over the content of those inserts or over other written warrungs related to that drug over other written warnings related to that drug.
- 6. ... As part of my duties, I provided licensed healthcare providers with FDA-approved informational materials about Redux. I also trained the Wyeth sales representatives I supervised - MINORIMANUMA MINISTERIA ANDRE CAMBRES A MARIE CONTRACTOR OF THE STATE OF THE STAT to provide licensed healthcare providers with FDA-approved materials about Redux. My knowledge of Redux was derived exclusively from education provided to me by Wyeth. Wyeth provided me with the FDA-approved package insert and other information regarding Redux.
- 7. I was not aware of any alleged association between Pondimin and/or Redux and valvular heart disease until the time such an allegation was first publicized. I was not aware before that ... time of any study, report or other literature which claimed that an association exists between Pondimin and/or Redux and valvular heart disease or that anyone had alleged such an association. I was not aware of any information in Wyeth's possession concerning such an association: Thus, I could not have informed doctors or diet drug users of any alleged association between Pondimin and/or Redux and valvular heart disease. I never intentionally misrepresented the safety, efficacy or state of testing of Pondimin or Redux alone or in combination with phentermine to any licensed healthcare provider or to any diet drug user.

- I am not a medical doctor or pharmacist. I have no specialized medical or pharmacological education, except what I received from Wyeth:
- 9. I was not expected, as area account director or area account manager, to contluct independent research regarding the drugs I detailed, and did not do so. I was not expected to. and did not, review independent scientific studies published in journals unless they were supplied to me by Wyeth.
- At no time have I ever distributed or supplied the dier dings Redux, Pondimin, or ZETIO RITIE TIES & T AAAR TIES TO THE TIES phentermine to healthcare providers, pharmacies, or anyone else.
- I made no representations regarding Pondimin, Redux, phentermine, or the "fen-phent" combination; whether by way of promotion or advertising or otherwise to the general public.

Sworn to and subscribed before me this

Case 2:02-cv-20135-HB Document 18-2 Filed 04/08/2005 Page 23 of 29

EXHIBIT D

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

DEC 2 2 2003

WESTERN DISTRICT OF LOUISIANA

HOBERT HY BREWNELL CLERK

LAKE CHARLES DIVISION

URSURA WESTBROOK, ET VIR.

DOCKET NO. 03-1918

VS.

JUDGE MINALDI

WYETH, ET AL.

MAGISTRATE JUDGE WILSON

REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION

Before the court is plaintiffs' Motion to Remand [doc. # 12].

Background

On September 12, 2003, Ussura Westbrook and Donald Westbrook filed the instant suit in the 14th Judicial District Court for the Parish of Calcasien, State of Louisiana. Made defendants were: Wyeth, Michael J. Wicks, and Kevin S. Brown. The petition alleges that Ussura Westbrook suffered severe injury to her heart valves due to her use of prescription diet drugs, dexfendiumnine ("redux") and/or fendiumnine ("pondium"), that were manufactured or promoted by defendants. (Petition, ¶ 11-13, 84, 87).

On October 17, 2003, Wyeth removed the case to federal court on the basis of diversity jurisdiction. 28 U.S.C. § 1332. Plaintiffs are Louisiana citizens. (Notice of Removal, 15). Wyeth is a Delaware corporation, with its principal place of business in New Jersey. Id. at 16. However, individual defendants, Michael J. Wicks, and Kevin S. Brown, are citizens of Louisiana for purposes of diversity. Id. at 17. To circumvent the obvious lack of diversity

¹ The motion has been referred to the undersigned for decision pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(A).

between plaintiffs and the individual defendants, Wyeth alleged in its notice of removal that plaintiffs have no reasonable possibility of recovery against the non-diverse parties; and thus, their presence should be disregarded for purposes of determining diversity (i.e. "fraudulent joinder"). Id. Plaintiffs disagree with Wyeth's assessment of their claims against Wicks and Brown. Accordingly, on November 13, 2003, the Westbrooks filed the instant motion to remand alleging lack of subject matter jurisdiction due to incomplete diversity. 28 U.S.C. § 1332.2

On November 17, 2003, the undersigned issued a minute entry notifying the parties that if the court found that plaintiffs had reasonable possibility of recovery against Michael I. Wicks, and Kevin S. Brown, then summary judgment would be recommended sua sponte in favor of said defendants. Parties were invited to file any additional briefs and/or competent summary judgment evidence addressing the relevant issue(s). The delays have expired, and the matter is now before the court.

Frandulent Joinder

Once a case has been removed, the burden lies with the removing party to prove that the court has jurisdiction to decide the claim. Jernigan v. Ashland Oil Inc. 989 F.2d 812, 815 (5th Cir. 1993)(citing, Dodson v. Spiliada Maritime Corp., 951 F.2d 40, 42 (5th Cir. 1992)). If jurisdiction is alleged on the basis that non-diverse parties have been fraudulently joined, then the removing party must establish either: "actual fraud in the pleading of jurisdictional facts," or "an inability of the plaintiff to establish a cause of action against the non-diverse party in state court."

² Plaintiff does not contest that the amount in controversy exceeds the requisite jurisfictional minimum. See, 28 U.S.C. § 1332. Moreover, we have reviewed plaintiff's allegations and the Notice of Removal. We are satisfied that plaintiff's claims exceed the jurisdictional minimum.

Travis v. Irby, 326 F.3d 644 (5th Cir. 2003) (citing, Griggs v. State Farm Lloyds, 181 F.3d 694, 698 (5th Cir. 1999)). Here, Wyeth does not dispute that Wicks and Brown are Louisiana citizens. Accordingly, our focus is the second basis for frandulent joinder. See, Travis, supra. In resolving this issue, we must determine,

whether [plaintiff] has any possibility of recovery against the party whose joinder is questioned. If there is arguably a reasonable basis for predicting that the state law might impose liability on the facts involved, then there is no fraudulent joinder. This possibility, however, must be reasonable, not merely theoretical.

Travis, supra (quoting, Great Plains Trust Co. v. Morgan Stanley Dean Witter & Co., 313 F.3d 305, 312 (5th Cir. 2002) (emphasis added; internal citation and quotations omitted)).

The district courts may "pierce the pleadings" and entertain summary judgment-type evidence; but we must also consider "all unchallenged factual allegations" in the light most favorable to the plaintiff. *Travis, supra*. Any contested issues of fact and ambiguities of state law must be resolved in favor of remand. *Id*.

Discussion

Plaintiffs allege that Wicks and Brown were Wyeih sales representatives who promoted Pondimin and/or Redux diet drugs to physicians. (Petition, ¶84). Plaintiffs further allege that Wicks and Brown knowingly provided misleading and false information regarding the safety of Pondimin and/or Redux. Id. These acts contributed to plaintiffs' damages. Id.

In its opposition to remand, Wyeth adduced a copy of a "Rice Form" wherein Ursma Westbrook indicated under penalty of perjury that she was only prescribed, and only consumed Pondimin. (Def. Exh. Q). However, Wicks and Brown never promoted Pondimin. (Def. Exhs. R & S). They also did not leave samples with the physicians. *Id.* Furthermore, Wicks and Brown were not aware of any association between Pondimin and Redux and valvular heart

disease until it was first publicized by the media in September 1997. Id. In sum, Wicks and Brown did not breach any duty owed to plaintiffs which could have caused their damages. See generally, Mundy v. Dept. of Health & Human Res., 620 So.2d 811, 813 (La. 1993).

Accordingly, the uncontroverted evidence establishes that plaintiffs do not have a reasonable possibility of recovery against the individual defendants.⁴ Having found that plaintiffs have no reasonable possibility of recovery against the non-diverse defendants, their presence must be disregarded for purposes of determining diversity. The remaining parties (plaintiffs and Wyeth) are completely diverse. We may properly exercise subject matter jurisdiction. 28 U.S.C. § 1332.

As noted by the Fifth Circuit, "[s]mmnary judgment will always be appropriate in favor of a defendant against whom there is no possibility of recovery." Carriere v. Sears, Roebuck & Co., 893 F.2d 98, 102 (5th Cir.1990). We have found that plaintiffs have no reasonable possibility of recovery against defendants, Michael J. Wicks, and Kevin S. Brown. Accordingly, it is appropriate to enter summary judgment in favor of said defendants, dismissing with

We further observe that the only duty owed by detailmen is to deliver and explain the new package inserts to the physicians in their tearitory. Wallace v. Upjohn Co., 535 So.2d 1110 (La. App. 1* Cir. 1988), writ denied, 539 So.2d 630 (La. 1989). However, plaintiffs' petition is devoid of any specific allegations that the detailmen failed to provide the product insert to her physician(s) or that they failed to explain the product insert. See, Griggs v. State Farm Lloyds, 181 F.3d 694, 699 (5* Cir. 1999)(a petition which fails to state any specific actionable conduct on the part of a non-diverse defendant does not satisfy the liberalized requirements of notice pleading such as to state a valid cause of action). Thus, on its face, plaintiffs' petition does not state a cause of action against the non-diverse defendants.

⁴ Donald Westhrook's loss of consortium claim is derivative of Ursura Westbrook's claim; and disposition of the latter claim compels the same disposition of the former. See, Dumas v. Angus Chemical Co., 728 So.2d 441, 452 (La. App. 2d Cir. 1999); Benavides v. County of Wilson, 955 F.2d 968, 975 (5th Cir. 1992).

prejudice plaintiffs' dains against them.

For the foregoing reasons,

IT IS RECOMMENDED that plaintiffs' motion to remand [doc. #12] be DENIED.

IT IS FURTHER RECOMMENDED that judgment be entered in favor of defendants, Michael J. Wicks, and Kevin S. Brown, dismissing with prejudice plaintiffs' claims against said defendants only.

Under the provisions of 28 U.S.C. §636(b)(1)(C), the parties have ten (10) business days from receipt of this Report and Recommendation to file any objections with the Clerk of Court. Timely objections will be considered by the district judge prior to a final ruling.

FAILURE TO FILE WRITTEN OBJECTIONS TO THE PROPOSED FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS CONTAINED IN THIS REPORT WITHIN TEN (10) BUSINESS DAYS FROM THE DATE OF ITS SERVICE SHALL BAR AN AGGRIEVED PARTY FROM ATTACKING ON APPEAL, EXCÉPT UPON GROUNDS OF PLAIN ERROR, THE UNOBJECTED-TO PROPOSED FACTUAL FINDINGS AND LEGAL CONCLUSIONS ACCEPTED BY THE DISTRICT COURT.

THUS DONE AND SIGNED in Chambers at Lake Charles, Louisiana, this

December, 2003.

ES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

FEB - 2 2004

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT WESTERN DISTRICT OF LOUISIANA

LAKE CHARLES DIVISION

URSURA WESTBROOK, ET VIR.

DOCKET NO. 03-1918

VS.

JUDGE MINALDI

wyeth, et al.

MAGISTRATE JUDGE WILSON

JUDGMENT

For the reasons stated in the Report and Recommendation of the Magistrate Judge previously filed herein and after an independent review of the record, and a de novo determination of the issues, and consideration of the objections filed herein, and having determined that the findings are correct under applicable law,

IT IS ORDERED that plaintiffs' motion to remand [doc. # 12] be, and it is hereby DENIED.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED, ADJUDGED, and DECREED that judgment be, and it is hereby entered in favor of defendants, MICHAEL J. WICKS, and KEVIN S. BROWN, dismissing with prejudice plaintiffs, URSURA WESTBROOK and DONALD WESTBROOK's claims against said defendants only.

THUS DONE AND SIGNED in Chambers at Lake Charles, Louisiana, this 2_ day

UNRIED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE